

No. ID/YMN/71/82/25124.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Joginder Lal and the management of M/s Bawa Dasonda Singh Varyam Singh Saharan pur Road, Yamunanagar, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Faridabad constituted,—*vide* Government notification No. 11495-G-Lab/57/11245 dated 7th February, 1958 read with notification No. 5414-3-Lab 68/15254 dated 20th June 1968 under section 7 of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matters relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication.—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Joginder Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/FD/54/82/25142.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between the workman Shri Ram Dhan and the management of M/s Chief Administrator, Faridabad Complex Administration, Faridabad, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad constituted under section 7 A of the said Act the matters specified below, being either in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Ram Dhan was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/GGN/12/82/25149.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Sunder Lal and the management of M/s Market Committee, Rewari regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Faridabad constituted,—*vide* Government notification No. 11495-G-Lab/57/11245 dated 7th February, 1958, read with Notification No. 5414-3 Lab-68/15254 dated 20th June, 1968 under section 7 of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Sunder Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The 7th June, 1982

No. ID/FD/66/82/25765.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Sunil Kumar and the management of M/s Trans Auto D. L. F. Industrial Area, Mathura Road, Faridabad regarding the matters hereinafter appearing,

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Faridabad constituted,—*vide* Government Notification No. 11495-G-Lab/57/11245 dated 7th February, 1958 read with Notification No. 5414-3 Lab-68/15254 dated 20th June, 1968 under section 7 of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matters relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Sunil Kumar was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?